

Drs de Hartog states that "the p-mastigophores and amastigophores mentioned by Hand are nothing more than two size-classes of a single type of nematocyst, p-mastigophores". We stand by Hand's original diagnosis of the cnidom of *Haliplanella luciae*. The difference between these two types of nematocyst is often evident only in preparations from live animals.

Few taxonomic studies on this group of actinians have been published since *Haliplanella* was defined by Hand in 1956. Drs. de Hertog's opinion that *Haliplanella* does not merit placement in its own family is shared by, for instance, Widersten (1976, *Fish Bull.* vol. 74: 857-878), but even Widersten recognizes the validity of the genus.

COMMENTS ON THE APPLICATION CONCERNING *SIMIA*
SYNDACTYLA RAFFLES, 1821 (MAMMALIA: HYLOBATIDAE).
Z.N.(S.) 2195

(1) By Jack Fooden (*Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, Illinois*
60605, USA)

The Commission has been requested by Groves (1977, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34: 104-105) to give precedence to *Simia syndactyla* Raffles, 1821, over "*Simia gibbon* C. Miller, 1779" as the name for the siamang, which is now universally known either as *Hylobates syndactylus* or *Symphalangus syndactylus*. However, such action by the Commission is unnecessary because, as shown below, C. Miller's use of the name "*simia gibbon*" for the siamang is based on a misidentification, and this name therefore is not available for this species (Article 49 of the Code).

2. The complete reference to the Sumatran siamang in the published extracts of C. Miller's correspondence (1779: 170) is: "We have abundance of the *simia gibbon* of Buffon: they are quite black, about three feet high, and their arms reach to the ground when they stand erect; they walk on their hind legs only, but I believe very rarely come down to the ground. I have seen hundreds of them together on the tops of high trees".

3. In this passage the name "*simia gibbon* of Buffon" clearly is not proposed as a new name for the siamang, but instead is erroneously used to identify the siamang with the animal that Buffon (1766: 92) designated by the vernacular name "Le Gibbon" (= *Hylobates lar* (Linnaeus, 1771): 521). Therefore, according to Article 49, "*simia gibbon*" may not under any circumstances be retained for the siamang. Accordingly, no action is required by the Commission to protect the priority of *Simia syndactyla* Raffles, 1821, from competition with "*simia gibbon*" of C. Miller, 1779.

4. If the published extracts of C. Miller's correspondence are regarded as constituting a binominal work, which is itself questionable on grounds of inconsistent application of binominal nomenclature (Code Article 11c), this author's use of the name "*simia gibbon* of Buffon" falls as a harmless junior synonym of *Homo lar* Linnaeus, 1771, which is also based on "Le Gibbon" of Buffon.

REFERENCES

- BUFFON, G.L.L. de, 1766. Le Gibbon in Buffon & Daubenton, L.J.M., *Histoire naturelle, générale et particulière*. . . (Paris, Imprimerie Royale), vol. 14: 92-95
- LINNAEUS, C., 1771. *Mantissa plantarum altera* (Holmiae, L. Salvius)

(2) By Colin Groves (*Australian National University,
Canberra ACT 2600, Australia*)

Fooden's point is interesting, but I think the matter still needs clarification, especially as at least two authorities (Matschie, 1898, *Sitzungsber. Ges. naturf. Freunde Berlin*, 1898: 209-212; Simonetta, 1957, *Atti Soc. tosc. Sci. nat.*, B, vol. 64: 53-112) have considered Miller's name truly binominal and available for the siamang.

Fooden cites Article 49 of the Code, which states: "The specific name used in an erroneous specific identification cannot be retained for the species to which the name was wrongly applied. . .". Whether this article applies to the present case is a moot point:

(1) Buffon, as an author who not only did not use binominal nomenclature, but explicitly rejected it, can hardly be said to have created any name under the binominal system, so Miller cannot have "wrongly applied" any such name. Miller's name is thus surely *de novo*, despite his reference to Buffon.

(2) Buffon wrote in French, and referred to "Le Gibbon", not *Simia gibbon*; Miller wrote in English (and was correctly quoted by Fooden), so his usage of *Simia gibbon* is Latin and binominal; it is not a vernacular and not a direct quotation from Buffon. It is, moreover, the only scientific name in the work, so that the question of inconsistency does not arise.

It seems to me, therefore, that as the name *Simia gibbon* was first used by Miller, and in a correct binominal fashion, it is an available name (as recognised by Matschie and Simonetta) and so liable to be resurrected by the priority-minded. At the very least it is open to this interpretation and needs to be dealt with by the Commission.